



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/534,433	03/23/2000	David L. Patton	80521F-P	1516
1333 7590 06/19/2008 EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY PATENT LEGAL STAFF 343 STATE STREET ROCHESTER, NY 14650-2201			EXAMINER CARTER, MONICA SMITH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3700	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/19/2008 PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte DAVID L. PATTON

Appeal 2008-0764
Application 09/534,433
Technology Center 3700

Decided: June 19, 2008

Before WILLIAM F. PATE, III, JENNIFER D. BAHR, and MICHAEL W.
O'NEILL, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

BAHR, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

ORDER REMANDING TO THE EXAMINER

This application is remanded to the Examiner, pursuant to 37 C.F.R.
§ 41.50(a)(1), for appropriate action with regard to the following issues.

David L. Patton (Appellant) appeals under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from the
Examiner's decision rejecting claims 12, 14, 18-23, 25, and 29-34.¹ This is

¹ Claims 1-11, 13, 15-17, 24, and 26-28 have been canceled.

the Appellant's second appeal before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. In the first appeal (2005-1291, Decision mailed July 25, 2005), the decision of the Examiner to reject claims 12, 14, 18-23, 25, and 29-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) was reversed. We have jurisdiction over this appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 6 (2002).

In the Final Rejection mailed June 9, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 12, 14, 19-21, 23, 30-32, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gutttag (US 5,120,089, issued June 9, 1992) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gutttag in view of Denenberg (US 5,673,338, issued September 30, 1997) and further in view of Schlauch (US 6,082,774, issued July 4, 2000) (Page 2 of the Final Rejection), and claims 18, 22, 29, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gutttag in view of Denenberg and Schlauch, and further in view of Martin (US 5,601,683, issued February 11, 1997) or Burnham (US 4,884,828, issued December 5, 1989) (Page 5 of the Final Rejection).

In the Appeal Brief filed on September 21, 2006, under the heading of "Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal," the Appellant states that the issue of the instant appeal is whether the invention of claims 12, 14, 18-23, 25, and 29-34 is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Gutttag or, in the alternative, unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gutttag in view of Denenberg and Schlauch (App. Br. 3). In the "Arguments" section of the Appeal Brief, the Appellant likewise addresses only a single rejection of claims 12, 14, 18-23, and 29-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Gutttag or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gutttag in view of Denenberg and Schlauch (App. Br. 4). Upon a careful review of the Appeal Brief it appears that the Appellant has omitted the rejection of claims 18, 22,

29, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Gutttag in view of Denenberg and Schlauch, and further in view of Martin or Burnham and has grouped all of the pending claims 12, 14, 18-23, 25, and 29-34 under a single rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Gutttag, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gutttag in view of Denenberg and further in view of Schlauch. Although the Appellant's characterization of the rejection appears to omit any reliance on the teachings of Martin and Burnham, we note that the Appellant specifically refers to Martin and Burnham in his arguments (App. Br. 7).

In the Examiner's Answer mailed on March 9, 2007, under the heading of "Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal," the Examiner agrees with the Appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection (Ans. 3). Specifically, the Examiner states that the ground(s) of rejection in the instant appeal is the rejection of claims 12, 14, 18-23, 25, and 29-34 as being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Gutttag or, in the alternative, as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gutttag in view of Denenberg and further in view of Schlauch (Ans. 3). Therefore, like the Appellant, the Examiner omits the separate rejection of claims 18, 22, 29, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gutttag in view of Denenberg and Schlauch, and further in view of Martin or Burnham and groups all of the pending claims 12, 14, 18-23, 25, and 29-34 under a single rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Gutttag or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gutttag in view of Denenberg and further in view of Schlauch. Although the Examiner does not mention Martin or Burnham in either the statement of the rejection or in the response to arguments in the Answer, the Examiner does list both Martin and Burnham as "Evidence Relied Upon" (Ans. 3), thus giving the

impression that Martin and Burnham are relied upon in the rejection(s) involved in the appeal.

In light of the conflicting indications discussed above, the record is unclear as to which grounds of rejection are under appeal. Specifically, it is unclear whether the final rejection of claims 18, 22, 29, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gutttag in view of Denenberg and Schlauch, and further in view of Martin or Burnham has been withdrawn in favor of a new ground of rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gutttag or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gutttag in view of Denenberg and further in view of Schlauch.

This application is therefore remanded to the Examiner to make a determination, on the record, as to the grounds of rejection which are under appeal, while also giving the Appellant an opportunity to respond thereto. In response to this remand, the Examiner must clarify whether: (1) the Appellant's statement in the Appeal Brief of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is incorrect or (2) the final rejection of claims 18, 22, 29, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gutttag in view of Denenberg and Schlauch, and further in view of Martin or Burnham is being withdrawn in favor of a new ground of rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gutttag or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gutttag in view of Denenberg and further in view of Schlauch.

This remand to the Examiner pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(a)(1) is made for further consideration of a rejection. Accordingly, 37 C.F.R. § 41.50(a)(2) applies if a supplemental examiner's answer is written in response to this remand by the Board.

REMANDED

EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY
PATENT LEGAL STAFF
343 STATE STREET
ROCHESTER, NY 14650-2201